

# **NC Source Water Collaborative December 14, 2012 Meeting Summary**

## **Attendees**

The following people attended the meeting:

Aдриene Weaver, DWQ	Amy Axon, DWR	Amy Keyworth, DWQ
Beth McGee, CWMTF	Christy Perrin, NCSU	Cy Stober, PTRC
Dale Threatt-Taylor, DSWC	Holly Denham, DWR	Jay Frick, DWR
Julie Elmore, NRCS	Keith Starner, NCRWA	Linnette Weaver, DWR
Lisa Corbitt, Mecklenburg Co HD	Phil Trew, HCCOG	Rick Seekins, KTCOG
Sarah Bruce, TJCOG	Sean McGuire, DWR	Susan Kubacki, DWQ

## **Meeting Purpose**

The goals for the December Meeting were to share the progress of the two initiatives that the break out teams are working on; to review the SW Collaborative's first year of success; and to discuss ideas for ensuring that the SW Collaborative continues to grow and stay strong.

## **Team Progress**

### **Meeting Schedules**

The teams discussed and agreed on a meeting schedule and wanted to share this decision with the group as a whole to ensure acceptance. The plan is that each team would meet once between the quarterly collaborative meetings and then both teams would meet on the day of the collaborative meetings. Therefore, the collaborative meetings will be scheduled for three hours, with 1-1/2 hour at the end set aside for team meetings.

The Collaborative members agreed to this schedule.

### **Awards Program Initiative – Progress Report**

The goal is to develop an awards program that builds excitement around and incentivizes source water protection efforts.

The team had their first meeting in mid-October. The team took into consideration the findings of survey results, discussed the need for researching existing awards programs and brainstormed potential applicant pools and types of awards. We also discussed whether we should build an awards program that is based on specific groups of people or to build the program around specific types of awards. We concluded that it would have to be a little bit of both. Therefore, the team decided to start small by defining 3 categories of awards: Education, Planning and Implementation.

We concluded with defining our next steps:

1. Conduct research on pre-existing awards programs both in and out of the state
2. Look into potential on-line document and information sharing technologies that we could use to help our team work more efficiently.
3. Write up a description of the three award categories that the team identified as a potential starting point.

## Education Package Initiative – Progress Report

The general goal is to create source water protection education packages that target specific stakeholder groups.

The team had their first meeting in October. During this meeting we spent a good amount of time brainstorming. A few key issues came from the brainstorming session.

1. We need to either do a better job of educating everyone on what “source water protection” means or start using an easily recognizable and understandable term (i.e. Drinking Water Protection). We felt this was an issue that we would like the whole collaborative to consider.
2. We need to identify and publicize the potential benefits of source water protection the specific group of stakeholders can relate to (i.e. reduction in cost of water treatment, human health benefit and better support of the whole ecosystem.)
3. The educational tools that we develop need to be easily understood, readily available and contain specific actions that can be taken to help.

The team identified 3 initial ideas to start working on

1. Develop an education package to assist the drinking water protection planning projects that may be funded by CWMTF.
2. Survey our targeted audiences to see what their existing understanding of source water protection is and what their education needs are.
3. Develop an education package that is tailored to a watershed and its specific issues. In order to do this, the team will use state and local expertise and data to identify a pilot watershed that has specific characteristics (i.e. citizens live in the watershed that is used to provide their drinking water; there are impaired streams, etc.) We will then create outreach materials for that watershed’s citizens.

## Project Planning Process

Amy Axon proposed that the teams incorporate the project planning process while developing their respective initiatives. An overview of the process was provided to the group.

The **planning process** has 5 key components

1. Needs Assessment (Surveys)
2. Design (create a program logic model)
3. Develop (selection of content and delivery methods)
4. Implementation (pilot the project)
5. Evaluation (measure success during and at end of project)

The design component implements a logic model. This component is the most involved and is what our teams are getting into right now.

The **design logic model** is made up of 4 main categories:

1. Objectives
2. Resources
3. Activities and Outputs
4. Outcomes (short, mid and long term)

The **design process has 5 steps:**

1. Identify the intended impacts of the project (long-term outcome), what behaviors your audience will need to adopt (mid-term outcomes) and what is the change needed in the audience's knowledge for these outcomes to occur (short-term outcomes).
2. List the activities and outputs that will support achievement of the outcomes (these are things we will have to create or do)
3. Identify and list the resources needed or available to undertake the project (if these resources are unattainable, rethink the outcomes)
4. Read the model left to right as a series of if...then statements to see if these are logical, if not fill in gaps or revise outcomes.
5. Restate the outcomes as SMART objectives and write them on the left side of the model.  
(Specific, Measureable, Audience focused, Realistic, Time specific)

The Collaborative members were in general agreement that this process would be a helpful tool and that the teams would attempt to utilize the planning process when appropriate.

### **Year in Review, Ongoing SWP Efforts, Collaborative Strengthening**

Jay Frick provided a perspective on the SW Collaborative's first year. The presentation highlighted progress made by the SW Collaborative and areas where improvements might be realized.

The presentation started with a recap of the initial workshop in December of 2011. It was noted that the group started without a clear expectation of where the effort would lead. It was also noted that the workshop was initiated with 39 volunteers and participation had since declined somewhat. To put the group's progress in context, it was pointed out that we have only met four times and logged roughly twelve hours of contact time.

Next, the vision and mission statements were reviewed. The group remained satisfied with the wording, and it was mentioned that the National SW Collaborative took an entire year to finalize a mission statement. It was noted that we have 19 signatory members of the SW Collaborative. The vast majority of which are either president or executive director of the respective organizations. Therefore, there is high level support for the SW Collaborative.

The SW Collaborative web pages were displayed and discussed as progress made on infrastructure necessary for the group to function. We then reviewed our brainstorming efforts that led to the creation of our four major objectives and the prioritized list of initiatives that had been adopted by the group. Discussion followed regarding progress of the special project groups and the initiatives that they were working on. Some examples were shown that demonstrate potential synergy between the SW Collaborative's goals and actions of other programs.

The final segment of the presentation focused on several questions designed for discussion: (i) What might strengthen our Collaborative? (ii) What type of branding and promotion do we need to solidify our identity? and (iii) What measures can we take to increase participation?

### **Summary of Group Discussion**

1. Name Recognition Recommendations:

Name branding and logo development need to be on the next agenda. We should decide on our name before developing a logo. We should keep our name, however, using drinking water protection in outreach materials.

2/19//2013

Page **3** of **4**

Along with developing a logo and name, we may want to coin a term like “The SW Collaborative - Protecting the water you drink”.

2. Strengthening Recommendations:

- A first Anniversary press release stating all that we have accomplished.
- Email all of the original participants summarizing the accomplishments in bulleted points.
- Make it clear that the group is opening and welcoming to all who would like to participate.
- A strategy might be to set meetings for the year?
- The Randleman dam/ Deep River pending Supreme Court decision may have impact on drinking water sources and water rights. The case could set precedent for how we use water and who gets how much. The Collaborative may want to get updated in this case. Richard Whisnant and Erin Wynia are good sources for information. We may want to invite them to our next meeting. Erin maintains a newsletter called EcoLink that provides up to date information on legislative and legal issues.

**Adjourned to Enjoy Cake and Break into Work Teams**

